

2

THE
INSPECTOR Inspected:
OR,
Dr. HILL's STORY
OF
ELIZABETH CANNING
Examined, and impartially Considered,
IN

A LETTER to that Gentleman;

In which all his vain SUBTERFUGES are
Detected and Confuted.

By *PHILOLOGUS.*

Ego Draus sum, non OEdipus. Ter. And. Act. I. Sc. 2.
Dan. v. 27.

Thou art weighed in the Balance, and art found wanting.
Exod. xx. 16.

Thou shalt not bear false Witness against thy Neighbour.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. BOUQUET, at the *White-Hart*, in *Peter-Nester-Row.* M.DCC.LIII. (Price 6d.)

зант
:hefogdil. 1973. 11

бюджета

кг

занятости

занятости

М. О. М. В. А.

М. О. М. В. А. (1973)

THE Inspector Inspected.

SIR, to begin at the

WHEN a Story of such an uncommon Nature, an Affair, attended with Circumstances so unusual, so hard to be paralleled, as the Case of *Elizabeth Canning* is, made its Appearance in the World, when Reason and Humanity, when Truth and Justice pleaded the Cause, and gave the Verdict in behalf of inno'r'd Innocence, who would expect to have the Justice of that Sentence call'd in Question, and such tumultuous Processes carried on in

each Bookseller's Shop ? But, that Ap-
this was the Consequence no one the
ignorant ; and this being the Cal- pro-
a zealous Regard for my Country sur-
Laws, and a Desire, if possible me
to find out the Truth, caused me cea-
to give my Attention to both Par- mo-
ties ; and I shall therefore make mu-
few impartial Remarks. so l

In the Beginning of your Book tha-
you endeavour to monopolize a Me-
Credit to your own Story, how im- Jun-
probable soever, by taking Pain vic-
to persuade the World, though sua-
without assigning any Reason for i- wh-
that Mr. *Fielding* is your Enemy Co-
and on this Account you would aln-
have him thought a Liar : And Int-
his Endeavour to support injure- ing-
Innocence is the Cause, I think it self-
Title he need not be ashamed o- wit-
You say you have ordered you in
Name to be put to the Pamphlet no-
that you may not be thought th- you

Autho-

Author of those others, which either Indigence or Ingenuity might produce : For my part, Sir, I assure you, neither of them has set me to work. But had you concealed it, I think you had acted more prudently : For what a Stain must it be to that Pen, which has so lately been employ'd in a Cause, that will ever add Honour to your Memory, to be now spreading Calumny around, in behalf of a convicted Vagrant, and desiring to persuade others out of their Senses, who do not chuse to submit their Consciences to your Faith ? (I had almost said Interest.) As for what Interest you may have in patronizing such a Creature, God and your self only know. But had you without any sinister View engaged in the Cause of Virtue and Innocence, it had been a Credit to you. But I shall make no farther Apology,

Apology, but begin at your own setting out, which I find to be from the *Daily Advertiser* of January the Sixth. Whereas Elizabeth Cannings went, &c. which is closed with a Supposition, and that a just and reasonable one too, I think, of her being forced away by Ruffians, and being heard to shriek out in a Hackney Coach in *Bishopsgate-Street*. The latter Part of this Supposition I do with you imagine to be a Mistake, so far as relates to the Coach so far am I from believing it, that she expressly says in her Affidavit * that when she came to her self, she perceived two Men hurrying her along a large Road-way, and that her Petticoats were dirtied; a clear Proof, as you observe, that there was no Coach.

* *Fielding*, p. 9. *Sessions Paper*, p. 109, 111.

Let us now examine your Objections. You ask *, why supposed to be forcibly taken away ? Why, or how can it be otherwise supposed ? For certainly there was much in the Case to authorize such an Imagination. Are these Transactions common, you ask ? I own that her Circumstance is something singular and unusual ; but yet we find Wickedness daily increasing to a higher Pitch among the Dregs of the Earth, and to what it may at last arrive, God only knows.

You say again, in the forecited Page †, To what purpose was she forc'd away, as she was not handsome, nor was her Dress tempting enough for any one to take her away to rob her ; and if it was, you allow the Place in which she was first attack'd, convenient enough for that Purpose, without the un-

* *Hill, p. 15.*

† *Ibid.*
necessary

necessary Trouble of dragging her some Miles distant ? To all these I answer, First, it was not for her Life ; otherwise they would not have used the Precaution of allowing her any thing by way of Sustenance. *Ergo*, it was done in order to lay Siege to her Virtue, and initiate her into the Tribe of Prostitutes. And that they should give themselves so much Trouble, will appear no great Cause for Wonder ; when we consider, that had their Scheme took, they would in Time have felt the Sweets of it, as well as have added to their Master's Kingdom, which would have afforded them some Satisfaction ; for if there is Joy in Heaven over one Sinner that repents, we must allow the Devil a malicious Pleasure in traducing a Soul from Virtue to Vice ; and so busy is he in enlarging his Empire, that he will leave no Stone

Stone unturn'd to add to his Dom-
nions. This Case is a sufficient
Proof of it ; this injured Innocent,
after being robb'd, and hurry'd
to a House of ill Repute, was by
Promises and Menaces strongly pur-
suaded to add to the Number of
Thieves (for Gypsies I esteem no
other) in *Squires's* Gang, and
Whores in Mother *Wells's* House :
And, therefore, if I may be al-
lowed the Words of our Saviour,
I would apply them to this Set of
People *, that they compass Earth
and Sea, try all Means to gain one
Proselyte, and when gained, make
him twofold more the Child of
Hell than themselves.

Thus, therefore, I think I have
shewn the Reason of her being
forced away, and thus used. But
why do I say thus used, to you who
deny the Story, and who, I doubt

* *Matt. xxiii. 15.*

not, but were a few weightier Arguments put in the Scale, would next endeavour to persuade us there is no such Person as *Elizabeth Canning* in the World ? However, I think I have to considerate Persons cleared up the Cause of this her Treatment, which was to starve her out of her Virtue ; but Heaven be praised, she held out the Siege to her Credit, and the Shame of those who defend such atrocious Wickedness. But now, Sir, should you, or your Adherents take in your Heads to say, if this was the Case, how came it that in all that Time neither the Men came to her to gratify their Lust, nor the Gypsy to see if she would comply ? I answer, Innocence is the peculiar Care of Heaven ; and the Devil cannot, without Divine Permission, do all the Mischief he would. They thought, had she been dead, the

Stench

Stench of her Body would soon inform them ; had she outlived her Chastity, they imagined she would acquaint them, to obtain more Liberty.

Thus that God, who prevented *Abimelech* from committing Folly with *Sarah*, who stopped the Lions Mouths whilst *Daniel* was in the Den ; who delivered *Shadrach*, *Mishach*, and *Abednego* from the fiery Furnace, preserved this Girl chaste, though in so bad a House.

Secondly. You say her Dress was not sufficient to tempt any one to rob her : But certain it is, that she was robbed, both in going to, and after she arrived at *Wells's* House ; and upon this Circumstance was *Squires* condemned ; to this *Canning* and *Vertue Hall* both positively swore. But the latter I know you will say is perjured.--- That, Sir, I will allow you ; but

whether in her Evidence or Recantation is the Query, and what I shall consider in its proper Place.

In answer to your Objection, if she was not carried in a Coach, how could those who carried her get along undiscovered ? I think Mr. *Fielding's* Answer (though you say he is your Enemy) sufficient to convince even you, Sir, if you have not utterly forsworn the Use of your Senses, and shall, therefore, quote it *verbatim*. * “ In Reality, the “ Darkness of the Night, at that “ Season of the Year, and when “ it was within two Days of the “ New Moon, and the Indifference “ of most Persons to what does “ not concern themselves, toge- “ ther with the Terror with which “ all honest Persons pass by Night “ through the Roads near this “ Town, will very sufficiently ac-

* *Fielding*, p. 16.

“ count

“ count for the Want of all Interruption to these Men, in the Conveyance of this poor Girl.”

But, to wind up your Thread as you have spun it, you tell us next, * That from the Day of this Publication, by which the World was informed of the Girl’s Usage, we hear no more of her till her Return Home. If by this you mean, that she was but once advertised, begging your Pardon, Sir, you lye---under a Mistake. But if you mean, we have no more Intelligence what became of her, pray, Mr. Conjurer, how should we ? For I dare to say, that for all your Skill, was you to be confined in a Room, stripped of Necessaries, and left with only Bread and Water, an old Grate, and some antiquated Cob-webs, as you are pleased to observe; I say, had it been thus with you,

* *Hill*, p. 16.

your

your Skill could not have contrived how to acquaint any one with your Condition : And I doubt not but could Canning's Friends have known where she was, the World would have saved much Trouble, and you and your Adherents much Scandal and Disgrace.

Again, you say and unsay in one and the same Page *; you first say, it was not on the Credit of Canning's Story that *Squires* was condemned, and then directly tell us, it was on the most full and clear Account given by one who declared she had seen all the Transactions of which the Court was concerned to judge : One who being a Stranger to the injured Person, and a Friend to the Convicts, it cannot be thought she would of herself add any thing to corroborate with, or strengthen the Prosecutors Evidence. What, Sir, is

* *Hill*, p. 17.

this, but a Proof of the Credit of her Story ? Did not *Hall's* Evidence add to the Belief of it ? And on this Credit were the Criminals condemned.

You say, we are now reviewing this Affair in a different Light, and are let into the Secret of its Origin. Pray, who is let into that Secret ? I believe nobody yet, unless yourself. You say, *Vertue Hall* has since freely and voluntarily declared, that her Evidence on the Trial was entirely false, and that she was actuated through Fear. That there is a Falshood somewhere, I will with you allow. But why is it not as likely to be in the Recantation as in her Evidence ? Indeed, why is it not more probable to be in the former than in the latter ? The Recantation, you say, was upon Oath ; so was her Evidence more than once. The Evidence she (or at least you for her) pretends to say was given through

through Fear ;---but of what ? For I do not in the whole Course of the Story find that any Thing was alledged against her, farther than being in Mother *Wells*'s House ; and as she was found in Company with the Prisoners, that might be sufficient Cause for her Commitment for farther Examination, though none for her Condemnation ; and if you allow the Truth of that Aphorism, *Conscia mens recti murus abeneus erit*, I do not apprehend she had then any thing to fear on that Score. But perhaps, Sir, you may have never had the Satisfaction to experience that to be true. If then there was any Fear in the Case, it could only proceed from the following Cause : That some of *Squires*'s Crew, Fellows of the vilest Principles, and capable of the basest Actions, had been with *Hall*, and threatned to murder her, unless she withdrew her Evidence, and promised

mised her Rewards if she would : And that this was the Case, the Treatment a poor Man lately met with, on Supposition of being one of *Canning's* Party, leaves Room to conjecture. To me, therefore, it very plainly appears, that her Recantation was more the Effect of Interest, than the Evidence of any Fear she was inspired with by *Canning's* Friends. Besides, had there been any Fallacy in the Evidence, certainly those Gentlemen in whose Hands the Lives of Subjects are entrusted, and the Jury before whom they are tried, were as capable of detecting it as you, or even his busy Lordship himself.

If *Hall's* first Confession was not true, how could it corroborate so exactly with *Canning's* Evidence, for it appears by Mr. *Fielding's* Account, that *Hall* never did hear *Canning's* Affidavit ? (And certainly,

Sir, he has as much Reason to expect to be credited as you.) Was not the Fact true, why should the Prisoners be so unwilling to be examined, as it appears they were ? And why should *Wells* forbid *Hall* making any Clack of the Affair ? And *Hall* in her Examination before Mr. *Fielding* owns her Unwillingness to confess to proceed from her Fear of Mother *Wells* or *Squires* §.

You next urge the Improbability of the Promise which was made her of fine Cloaths being perform'd: That likewise, Sir, I grant you ; but yet think it an Argument likely to prevail with Persons of no very acute Understanding, and as such, might be made use of to her ; and had she yielded, I doubt not but she would have found it unfulfilled.

* Sessions Paper, p. 114. + *Ibid.* p. 113.
§ *Fielding*, p. 40.

As to your next Query; whether she could foresee the Length of her Confinement, or how else could she proportion her Eating? I esteem it equally frivolous and ridiculous; and was your self to be thus treated, I make no Doubt, that you would have but little Stomach for Eating, especially when the Sustenance was only hard Crusts, and stale Water.

You say again, there appears no Cause why she did not make her Escape the first Night, as well as when she did. To this I answer, the Thing speaks for it self; when she was first imprisoned, she apprehended, that had she made any such Attempt, her Life must have paid for it; but her After-Treatment embolden'd her. And as for her getting Home, which you take Notice of, you cannot, unless you are wilfully ignorant, but be sensi-

C 2 ble,

ble, that Persons in a Fright, or under any Terror, are capable of performing more than at other Times. And her not declaring her Case till she got Home, might proceed from her Apprehensions of lighting on some of *Squires's* Gang, and being by them brought back, and us'd worse than at first.

Nor do I think the Time of her Travelling so publick as you would persuade us, as for her to be took notice of by Hundreds. She set out from *Enfield* at Four in the Afternoon, when the Days were short, and but few Persons care to be upon the Road, so dangerous is Travelling after dark : She did not reach Home till near Ten, between which Hours, the Roads are seldom over crowded. But supposing her to have been met by divers; miserable Objects are now so common, the more the Pity, that she might

might have been pass'd by many, with an Eye of Indifference and Neglect; and even you yourself, curious as you would be thought, and busy as you are, might have gone by her without regarding, especially, at a Time which hastened every one Home.

Thus much for her not telling her Case till she got to her Mother's: And that she then did, is evident from the Witnesses on the Trial *. She made no Hesitation in doing it, but with that readiness which is ever the Concomitant of Truth, declared her Case as well as her fatigued Spirits would permit.

Your next Wonderment is †, at the Quickness of the Transitions. But sure, Sir, your Judgment cannot be so weak as you would here make it be believed: For there

* Sessions Paper, p. 113, 114. † *Hill*, p. 22.
is

is the utmost Reason in the World for them to be thus quick. The Injury done to this poor Girl, was of a capital Nature; so long as she was there in Confinement, there was no Need for them to be under any Un-easiness; but when they found she was gone, they might reasonably imagine, that she would tell her Case, and what would be the Consequence of that, they were not ignorant. We may therefore conclude, that their first Step would have been to quit the Premises, and thereby confirmed the World in the Belief of what they now firmly credit. And certain I am, this would have been the Case, had not Justice quickly interfered to prevent. Though she made her Escape on the twenty-ninth, she was not missed by them till the thirty-first of *January*, and *February* the first they were apprehended.

This

This, Sir, sufficiently accounts for that Haste you seem to wonder at: It was done in order to prevent their escaping from the Hand of Justice. But pray, Sir, where does Mr. *Fielding*, or any other Person say, that *Canning* at her Return Home was emaciated, black, and putrid? I have made a strict Search for it, but can no where find it, unless in your Assertion. He says indeed *, that she returned in a weak and miserable Condition, almost starved to Death: Such also is her own Affidavit †, and confirmed by Witnesses on the Trial. But here is not a Word of black and putrid; in a miserable Condition she certainly was, was it only her Dress; but more so, in her bodily Alteration. And as you are a Physician, I presume I need not tell

* *Fielding*, p. 11. † *Ibid* p. 38. Sessions Paper, p. 113, 114.

you,

you, that there may be a visible Alteration in a Person's Body, without its being black and emaciated. Nor do I find that there was such a sudden Change for the better, or that she was so well on the first of *February*, or long after, as you would persuade us. You say you was told so by those present, but who were they? Whores and Gypsies, whose Words and Oaths are neither to be taken. For certainly the Character of an Informant, ought always to be considered.

You next say, it does not appear, that she was any where confined, unless by her own Consent. Certainly it does, by the Condition in which she returned Home; for few Persons voluntarily starve themselves. You say she did not return in that Condition; and because you say so, you would have us swallow the Morsel, however hard of Digestion,

gestion, and convincing Proofs to the contrary notwithstanding. Had she not been confined from her Friends, what Need was there to advertise her three Times, and each Time, to encrease the Reward for her Discovery? And had she been detained by her own Consent, she would certainly have made a better Bargain.

Your farther ridiculous Supposition, that she was employed with a Gallant, appears void of Foundation: For sure no Woman was ever treated by a Gallant as *Canning* was by *Squires*; and few Women are won by Cruelty: Besides, the Condition in which the Surgeon on the Trial swears she was*, is such as could afford Pleasure to but few Gallants; and the Character likewise which she bears confutes that. The Account we have thereof is, that she was a so-

* Sessions Paper, p. 115.

ber, honest, but withal a simple Girl; one who had behaved herself so as to gain the Good-will of all who knew her; but yet had not Wit enough, was she sufficiently wicked, to invent such a Story, which would require better Heads than yours or mine; that she was of a benevolent Temper, her kind Care for her little Brother shews, by procuring him a minced Pye, at her own Expence, though at last it served for her Nourishment: But the last Thing to be considered relating to her Character, is the tender Regard she had to Conscience; so scrupulous was she, so fearful of ignorantly giving in false Witness, so cautious of asserting any thing which might affect a Fellow-Subject's Life without sure Foundation, that when the Prisoners were under Examination at Mr. *Tyshemaker's*, after seeing *John Squires*, both in and

and out of his great Coat, she would not swear positively to him ; but only said he looked very much like one of the Men that robbed her * ; and *Vertue Hall* expressly says he was the Man †.

This, Sir, is the Character given by all who knew her, of this poor Girl, whom you would fain persuade us was wicked enough to invent such an unparallel'd Story : and if we are not to take her Character from her Acquaintance, from whom then are we to expect it ? Not from entire Strangers, surely. For you yourself, I think, would not be so ridiculous as to pretend to give a Character of one, of whom you know nothing at all. That this then is her Character, and that this Character adds Strength to the Credit of her Testimony, is indisputable.

* Sessions Paper, p. 114. † *Fielding*, p. 44.

The next Objection you take it in your Head to make, is to the Description *Canning* gave of the Room she was confined in. You say, you do not mean that Description she gave after she had seen it. Why then you mean none at all, for I am certain, she never did describe it, till after she had been long enough confined to observe every Thing therein. How could she describe a House in which she had never been, so exactly as she did *Wells's*? How could she describe the Kitchen to be on the right Hand going in, and the Number of Steps going from thence, to the Stair-foot Door? Which it is plain she did. Had *Squires* or Mother *Wells* given her this Intelligence? Certainly no. Ergo, she must have been there, and it must be her own Observation; for it does not appear, though

though you would have us think so, that any one went down, and returned to give her the Account. Certainly, had this been the Case, they would never on their Trial have omitted a Circumstance so much in their Favour, as this would have been, if prov'd. You appeal to that Account she gave before the sitting Alderman ; but this I imagine to be one of those Secrets you keep to yourself ; for in examining both Parties, I can no where, but in your own Assertion, find, that she ever described the Room, in the Manner you relate.

You say *, she declared it was a dark Room, but I presume, that in haste, and for want of your Spectacles, you might read dark for back ; she said, and still continues to say †, that there was a Grate, with an old Bed-Gown, which she made use of

* *Hill*, p. 25. † *Sessions Paper*, p. 110, 111.
to

to cover her, when she went Home, and a Handkerchief, which she tied about her Head, together with a Barrel, Saddle, Bafon, and Tobacco-Mould, and a little Hay to lie upon. But here is no Mention of Pictures, as you would have us believe she swore. This seems to be a pretty Sort of an Inventory, and suited to the Nature of the Place, a Lumber-Room, into which this poor Girl was put, to add thereto, as not being likely to be serviceable to them. Had she given other Evidence, why is it not by the Magistrate, before whom it was taken, made publick, in order to detect the Perjury ? But of all who espouse the Gypsy's Cause, none are so publickly audacious as your self. Even the Lord Mayor, whom you pretend to say, has strong Evidences in her behalf, has not yet told us so, and therefore we only take it on

on your Word, which may be false: In all her Account, there is no Mention made of Pictures, which you say she swore to, nor yet of Cob-webs, on which you lay so much Stress. But take Care, they are weak Things to hang by, and may perhaps fail you.

You argue from the Multitude of Cobwebs, there could have been no Grate in the Chimney for a long Time. Had you said there had been no Fire, you would have spoke with Reason, and I would allow it you, being of no Use to us; but Fires are seldom made in Lumber-Rooms, and Cobwebs there not very uncommon; even though Grates or other Things are in the Room, if those Things are not removed, the Cobwebs will remain unmolested. But supposing this Cobweb Story to be true; when did you ever see, or hear of any Cobwebs, of the

Thickness

Thickness of twelve or fourteen Inches, which is the Depth of but a common Chimney ? This Cobweb Story, therefore, seems like *Arachne's*, to be spun from yourself, and is not of so thick a Texture, as you would fain persuade us the Webs themselves were. And had *Canning* urged it in her behalf, it would have added but little Credit to her Testimony, since one Sweep with a Broom would destroy them in a Minute, though the Work of many Generations. And as for your admiring the Goodness of Providence in this Case, *Monstrum horrendum* ! But I hope, Sir, you will give me Leave, as well as your self, to admire that by and by. And in regard to the Casement you speak of, she could not see what was not there ; or if it was, your Cobwebs were too thick to discern any Thing but Imposture through them.

And

And now, Sir, I think, I have gone through all your Objections but one, on which you lay as much Stress as on the Cobweb Story, and is of much the same Force: That is, the Alibi Evidence. But this I look upon as nothing, since they contradict each other; and *Squires* contradicts them all *.

Gibbon says, the Gypsy lay at his House at *Abbotsbury*, from the First to the Ninth of *January*. *Clark* deposes, that on the Tenth, he met her, her Son and Daughter, on the Road for *London*, at *Crudeway-Foot*, three Miles from *Dorchester*; and *Grevil* asserts, they were at his House at *Coombe* on the Fourteenth of *January*: *Squires* herself declares, that on *New-Year's-Day*, being *Monday*, she lay at *Grevil's* House at *Coombe*, the next Day she was at *Stoptage*; but says

* Sessions Paper, p. 115, 116.

nothing where she lay, till *Friday* in the *New-Year-Week*, being *January* 5, when she says she lay at *Bagshot-Heath*, and on the Sixth, *Saturday*, she lay at *Old Brentford*, where she continued till the Ninth or Tenth, on one of which Days she went to *Wells's*, and continued there till her Apprehension ; and *Hall* says she was there long before*. And here is, sure, abundant Reason to wonder at the Quickness of Transitions, that she who declares herself, on the Ninth of *January*, to have laid either at *Old Brentford* or *Enfield*, should on the Tenth be seen within three Miles of *Dorchester*. Do you alledge the Alteration of the Style ? I reply, most Persons of her Rank follow the easiest Rule, and take the *Almanack* for their Guide ; and we have now no *Old Style* ; and that she meant *New Style* is plain by her

* Sessions Paper, p. 113.

her own Account, for by the *Old Calendar*, *New-Year's-Day* fell on a *Friday*; therefore she could not mean that, when she says, that *Friday*, in *New-Year-Week*, she lay at *Bagshot-Heath*. And here, Sir, I will with you admire the Goodness of Providence, that after this Story was thus contrived and swore to by her Friends to serve her, she had no Power to shelter herself under the Subterfuge: So strong did Conscience fly in her Face, that she could not help contradicting their Evidence; what she said, knock'd all *Gibbon's* Testimony on the Head, and much invalidates the others. Was she weary of her Life, that she thus endeavoured to shorten it? No sure; for if she could, she would have proved herself elsewhere, though not in the Place she was swore to be at. You pretend there

are divers Affidavits lodg'd in the Lord Mayor's Hands, to prove she was at *Abbotsbury*. But why are they not published, with the Persons Names who swore them, and by whom taken? I say, why are not these produced? Unless for Fear of being proved false.

The Remainder of your Book is taken up in a Repetition of those Falsities and Inconsistencies you have before mentioned: That *Canning* did not describe the House; but that she did is plain from the Evidence of Men of Credit and Repute, (before she went down after her Return Home.) That she did not describe *Squires* may be, but immediately pitched upon her as the Person, and you declare her to be an ill-looking Creature. The Case of *Vertue Hall*, being actuated through Fear, I have already considered, and shall only add, that Innocence,

Innocence, though attended by Ignorance is always bold, and has nothing to fear.

There is certainly great Reason to enquire, why *Judith Natus*, and her Husband did not appear. You pretend, they were kept out by the Mob; but this is a silly Excuse, for as the Laws of *England* are so mild and equitable, so cautious of a Subject's Life, as to defer a Trial upon the Prisoner's Declaration, that his Evidence is not ready; certainly Magistrates acting under those Laws, would never suffer such a material Evidence to be kept out by the Mob. The Reason then, why they did not appear, was, they knew the Story to be true, and apprehended themselves in Danger of being prosecuted on the Vagrant Act.

Thus, mighty Sophister, have I gone through all your Objections,

and laid as much Stress on them, as they will bear. That *Canning* was somewhere confined, is sufficiently known; that the House of Mother *Wells* was the Place, there is no Room to doubt, being a House of ill Fame; that *Squires* was there at the Time of the Robbery, is proved by the Evidence of several Persons of Credit and Repute, before three worthy Magistrates in that Neighbourhood, and that Evidence seconded by one of their own Gang; the Character of the Criminals was notoriously bad, that of *Canning* and her Friends as remarkably good. All which strengthens the Truth of *Canning's* Story. To confute this, you have sent out a Pamphlet into the World with your Name to it: And on Account of its being your Production, and for no other Reason, you would impose it on the World for Truth, and expect implicit

implicit Faith to be given to it, But why is not such a Train of Circumstances, and the Treatment poor *Lee* met with, on Supposition of being one of *Canning's* Party, to be considered? Why are not the Oaths of Men of Credit to be taken, rather than your bare Assertion? Why is the Understanding of both Judge and Jury to be called in Question to maintain your Inconsistencies? I assure you, Sir, I take no Pleasure in seeing my Fellow-Subjects Lives sacrificed to the Laws, but would rather have the Edge of the Sword of Justice softened, unless in Cases of unparallel'd Cruelty.

I shall now conclude with a solemn Declaration of my Sentiments, as they are now, and will remain till more convincing Proofs to the contrary shall appear, than any which have been yet produced.

And

(45)

And as we must all, on that awful Day, when the Secrets of all Hearts shall be made manifest, give Account, not only of our Words, but Thoughts, I declare, that I believe, and am firmly persuaded, on the best Ground and surest Foundation, that *Mary Squires*, who justly received Sentence of Death, but has since obtain'd his Majesty's most gracious Pardon, is guilty of the Robbery, and ill Usage of *Elizabeth Canning*; and that *Susanna Wells* was accessory thereunto.

June 18, 1753.

PHILOLOGUS.

F I N I S.

L.N.A.